



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/775,760

02/09/2004

Erik B. Christensen

MS1-1863US

8719

22801 7590 04/01/2008
LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2164

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/01/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/775,760 | Applicant(s) CHRISTENSEN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Sathyanarayan Pannala | Art Unit 2164 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's Amendment filed on 12/28/2007 has been entered. In this Office Action, claims 1-15 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2164

3. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker (US Patent 6,665,729) hereinafter Walker, and in view of Wookey et al. (USPA Pub. US 20040001514 A1) hereinafter Wookey.

4. As per independent claim 1, Walker teaches to compensate for limitations that arise when a transaction-based protocol is used together with stream based protocol, the stream-based protocol is modified to take advantages of certain characteristics of transaction-based protocols (col. 2, lines 50-54). Walker teaches the claimed, determining a size of a data structure (Fig. 3, col. 4, lines 50-54). Walker does not explicitly teach bulk data protocol. However, Wookey teaches the claimed, selecting a data streaming protocol when the size exceeds a predetermined limit (examiner interpreting data stream protocol as bulk data protocol) (page 20, paragraph [0297]). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Wookey's teachings would have allowed Walker's method to eliminate the confusing issue of which services to use, why the services are different and to facilitate the user with a single integrated service by the service provider. (page 1, paragraph [0007]). Walker teaches the claimed, selecting a buffered data protocol otherwise (Fig. 3, col. 4, lines 50-67). Walker teaches the claimed, sending data of the data structure consistent with the selected protocol (col. 1, lines 49-53).

5. As per dependent claim 2, Walker teaches the claimed, selecting a buffered data protocol further comprising serializing one or more data structures into a data transmission unit terminating with a delimiting code (Fig. 3, col. 3, lines 56-59).

6. As per dependent claim 3, Walker teaches the claimed, selecting a buffered data protocol further comprising including an end of data indicator for denoting when a data transmission vehicle is no longer in use (Fig. 3, col. 4, lines 65-67).

7. As per dependent claim 4, Walker and Wookey combined teaches claim 1. Wookey teaches the claimed, selecting a data streaming protocol further comprising streaming the data structure by: streaming a header, streaming the data structure and streaming an acknowledge code (Fig. 12, page 8, paragraph [0123]).

8. As per dependent claim 5, Walker teaches the claimed, selecting a data streaming protocol further comprising streaming the data structure by buffering a first portion of the data structure and streaming a second portion of the data structure (Fig. 3, col. 3, lines 56-59).

9. As per dependent claim 6, Walker and Wookey combined teaches claim 1. Wookey teaches the claimed, selecting a data transmission vehicle from a pool of available data transmission vehicles (page 3, paragraph [0046]).

Art Unit: 2164

10. As per dependent claim 7, Walker and Wookey combined teaches claim 1.

Wookey teaches the claimed, selecting a data transmission connection from a pool of available data transmission connections using round robin selection (Fig. 5, page 6, paragraph [0099]).

11. As per dependent claim 8, Walker teaches the claimed, formatting the data structure in accordance with at least one protocol chosen from a group consisting of: simple mail transfer protocol, POP3, hyper text transfer protocol, file transfer protocol and transfer control protocol/Internet protocol (col. 5, line 4).

12. As per dependent claim 9, further comprising using a transport vehicle for data transmission chosen from a group consisting of: HTTP transport, TCP transport, InterProcess Transport, InProcess Transport, SMTP transport and POP3 Transport (col. 5, line 4).

13. As per dependent claim 10, Walker teaches the claimed, selecting a transmission scheme chosen from a group consisting of: HTTP, SOAP.TCP, NET.TCP, MS.SOAP.XPROC, NET.IPC, MS.SOAP.INPROC, NET.INAPPDOMAIN, SOAP.MAIL, NET.MAIL and POP (col. 5, line 4).

14. As per independent claim 11, Walker teaches to compensate for limitations that arise when a transaction-based protocol is used together with stream based protocol,

the stream-based protocol is modified to take advantages of certain characteristics of transaction-based protocols (col. 2, lines 50-54). Walker teaches the claimed, processing data from memory (Fig.3, col. 4, lines 54). Walker teaches the claimed, determining a size of a data structure (Fig. 3, col. 4, lines 50-54). Walker does not explicitly teach bulk data protocol. However, Wookey teaches the claimed, selecting a data streaming protocol when the size exceeds a predetermined limit (examiner interpreting data stream protocol as bulk data protocol) (page 20, paragraph [0297]). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Wookey's teachings would have allowed Walker's method to eliminate the confusing issue of which services to use, why the services are different and to facilitate the user with a single integrated service by the service provider. (page 1, paragraph [0007]). Walker teaches the claimed, selecting a buffered data protocol when the size does not exceed the predetermined limit (Fig. 3, col. 4, lines 50-67). Walker teaches the claimed, sending data of the data structure consistent with the selected protocol (col. 1, lines 49-53).

15. As per dependent claim 12, Walker teaches the claimed, the determining means further comparing the size to the predetermined limit (Fig. 3, col. 4, lines 50-54).

16. As per dependent claim 13, Walker and Wookey combined teaches claim 1. Wookey teaches the claimed, prefacing the data structure with addressing information

means for denoting an end-of-message (Fig. 14, page 11-12, paragraph [0163] & [0176]).

17. As per dependent claim 14, Walker teaches the claimed, for exchanging information expressive of buffer size (col. 1, lines 57-61).

18. As per dependent claim 15, Walker teaches the claimed, buffering a first portion of the data structure and streaming a second portion of the data structure (Fig. 3, col. 3, lines 56-59).

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/28/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and details as follows:

a) Applicant's argument stated that Wookey fails to remedy the deficiencies in Walker about bulk data protocol."

In response to Applicant's argument, Examiner disagrees because Walker does teach as based on the type of protocol selected the data is transmitted (col. 1, lines 49-53). As Applicant agreed that Wookey teaches sending two types of information and one of them is a **Bulk data type**, see Remarks section, page 10, lines 7-9. It clearly indicates a decision is taken before sending the bulk data. Further, Bulk data protocol must be dealt in order to send bulk data. Therefore Wookey teaches missing part disclosed by Walker. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference

between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Conclusion

20. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sathyanarayan Pannala whose telephone number is (571) 272-4115. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2164

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sathyanarayan Pannala/
Primary Examiner

srp
March 27, 2008